Appln. No. 10/510,278 Amd. dated May 15, 2007 Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2006

## REMARKS

The Official Action of November 15, 2006, has been carefully reviewed. The claims in the application are now claims 1-24. Favorable consideration and formal allowance are respectfully urged.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicant's papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The specification has been objected to as not containing headings. Correction has been required. The objection and requirement are respectfully traversed.

As pointed out in the Office Action, the guidelines are simply that, i.e. "guidelines" and not requirements. In applicant's view, headings are not necessary.

On the other hand, applicant has no objection to headings, and hereby authorizes the examiner to insert such headings if the examiner remains adamant that the specification should have headings.

The abstract has been objected to as containing a reference to Fig. 3, and correction has been required.

Applicant respectfully requests that this matter be held in abeyance pending allowance of the application.

Appln. No. 10/510,278
Amd. dated May 15, 2007
Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2006

Indeed, applicant respectfully requests the examiner to delete "Figure 3" from the abstract by examiner's amendment.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under the second paragraph of §112. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As understood, the PTO objects to the wording "set of doors". It is not clear to applicant why this wording is considered objectionable. A "set of doors" means simply that the wall contains at least two doors as recited in the claims, and as clearly described in the specification.

If the examiner remains adamant, applicant would be agreeable to using different wording in place of a "set of doors", e.g. a "group of doors" or a "door assembly" or "a plurality of doors". The examiner's assistance is respectfully requested.

The claims have been amended above to place them in better form for U.S. practice. Thus, claims 1-17 are amended so that the wall is more positively claimed, and therefore will be understood to be more clearly included as part of the claimed subject matter. In addition, new claims 18-24 are added in order to claim the "set of doors" as such, applicant again indicating willingness to change "set of doors" to other appropriate language.

Applicant respectfully believes and submits that the claims as previously drafted, considered in light of the

specification (fully consistent with the law), would not have been confusing to those skilled in the art, and therefore the claims in their previous form are fully in accordance with §112. At worst, the claims in their previous form might be considered objectionable, but only as to form, requiring no substantial amendments relating to patentability.

Nevertheless, and as indicated above, and in deference to the examiner's views, a number of cosmetic amendments have been made. The amendments are of a formal nature only, i.e. made to place the claims in improved form for U.S. practice or the examiner's understanding of what is necessary or desirable for U.S. practice. The amendments are not "narrowing" amendments because the scope of the claims has not been reduced. No limitations have been added and none are intended.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

No rejections have been imposed on the basis of prior art, whereby applicant understands that the claims are deemed by the PTO to define novel and unobvious subject matter under §§102 and 103.

Newly added claims 18-24 are patentable for the same reasons as the other claims.

Appln. No. 10/510,278 Amd. dated May 15, 2007 Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2006

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon by the PTO have been noted, along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently material to warrant their application against any of applicant's claims.

Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Official Action have been addressed above in a manner that should lead to patentability of the present application. Favorable consideration and early formal allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

By

Sheridan Neimark

Registration No. 20,520

SN:kg

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\C\Call\COENRAETS10\pto\2007-05-15 PCTRPLY.doc